

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 14, 2008.

Claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44, and 46-49 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44, and 46-49. The present Response amends claims 1, 4, 16, 18, 30, 33, and 46, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44, and 46-49. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

A. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 4, 18, 30, 33 and 46-49 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 4, 18, 30, 33 and 46-49, as currently amended, conforms to the statutory requirement under 35 USC §112, and reconsideration of the rejection is requested

B. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 102 & 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-16, 18-27, 29-30, 32-42, 44, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Anuff et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628.

Claims 14, 28, and 43 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature “*wherein the set of controls includes a plurality of portlets wherein each of the plurality of portlets is a self-contained application implemented on one or more web servers that renders its own GUI and is capable of communicating with another portlet of the plurality of portlets.*”

Anuff discloses a portal server represents an HTML page that comprises a plurality of modules formatted in a pre-determined layout (Abstract).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Anuff does not teach or make obvious that the set of controls includes a plurality of portlets that can communicate with each other.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 30 and 46

Claims 16, 30 and 46, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-15, 17-29, 31-45 and 47-49

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 22-25 and 27-29 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

C. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 13, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/

Kuiran (Ted) Liu

Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800